

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/698,122	10/698,122 10/31/2003		Qiqing Christine Ouyang	YOR920030327US1	8933
24299	7590	02/08/2005		EXAM	INER
George Sai-			JACKSON JR, JEROME		
145 Fernwood Dr. Greenwich, RI 02818				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,				2815	
				DATE MAILED: 02/08/2009	,

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A'H					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Antion Commen	10/698,122	OUYANG ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Jerome Jackson Jr.	2815					
The MAILING DATE of this communicatio Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory i - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a recon. , a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed ((30) days will be considered timely. FHS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on	07 December 2004.						
	_ *** *** ****						
·=							
closed in accordance with the practice un	der <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-38</u> is/are pending in the applic 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>26-37</u> is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25 and 38</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	hdrawn from consideration:						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Exact 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the country. The oath or declaration is objected to by the specific state of the	s/are: a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square of the drawing(s) be held in abeyan correction is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B * See the attached detailed Office action for	ments have been received. ments have been received in A e priority documents have been cureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage					
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/12/04.	(8) Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 					

Application/Control Number: 10/698,122

Art Unit: 2815

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-25,38 in the reply filed on 12/7/04 is acknowledged.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1,2,5,8-10 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ouyang '799.

Ouyang teaches a silicon substrate 10, a SiGe layer 30, a silicon layer 34, and source and drain regions 12,14 of SiGe wherein the heterojunction coincides with the metallurgical junction (column 3 lines 35-40 and 62-65). There are no special process steps recited in the specification which would enable any better placement than the MBE or CVD processes recited in '799. Furthermore, in-situ doping during CVD or MBE and rapid annealing are well known in the art and would have been particularly obvious methods to produce the '799 device as precise location of the p-n junction is desired. Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 14 and 38 are rejected. Claim 9 is rejected as the thickness of the SiGe layer is stated to be in the range of an "inversion layer". Claim 10 is rejected as '799 teaches that the band-offsets are eliminated between the s/d and channel regions. Claim 14 because the thickness of 34 is about an inversion layer.

Art Unit: 2815

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11,13-25,35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouyang '799 in view of Ouyang et al 10/00 and Oda '019.

In regard to claims 3 and 4 reciting SOI structure, O (10/00) suggests a SOI embodiment (col.2 page 1947) for lower leakage and latch-up prevention as is well known for SOI. Note also that O shows embodiments where the misalignment is less than 5nm (figure 12). These devices are prima facie obvious or anticipated. The limitations "about" are also broad and undistinguishing over the applied art. Claim 6 is obvious as these orientations are standard in the art. Claims 7,15-25 are obvious as Oda suggests a CMOS embodiment for practice of CMOS circuitry and suggests the NMOS in the silicon layer. Claim 11 is obvious as Oda suggests Ge content in the range claimed for strain and high mobility. Claim 13 is obvious as these planes are standard in the art. Claim 38 is obvious as the statement of intended use "processor" does not structurally distinguish the claim over the applied art.

Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouyang '799 ,10/00, Oda, and further in view of Zhang '076 or Crawford '010.

Zhang and Crawford teach 110 crystal orientation for maximum mobility. It would have been obvious to have oriented transistors in particular directions to maximize the speed of the device. Claims 6 and 13 are obvious structure.

Application/Control Number: 10/698,122

Art Unit: 2815

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 12 is confusing because the source and drain region form a "top surface plane" and the recitation "raising above" is awkward. The structure of the top surface plane is also rather vague and indefinite.

Claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerome Jackson Jr. whose telephone number is 571 272 1730. The examiner can normally be reached on t-th 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on 571 272 1664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/698,122

Art Unit: 2815

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jj

JEROME JACKSON PRIMARY EXAMINEN